

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-3, 5-9, 20, and 27 are cancelled without prejudice. Claim 4 is amended and is in condition  
5 for allowance. This amendment is believed to be fully responsive to all issues raised in the 9/10/03 Office Action.

**§102 REJECTIONS**

Claims 10-15, 17-19 and 21-26 stand rejected as being anticipated by  
10 Japanese Patent JP-A-H11-198387 to Fujikawa hereinafter referred to as “Fujikawa”.

**Claims 10-15 and 17-19**

Claim 10 recites in pertinent part,

15 A method of forming fluid handling slots in a semiconductor substrate having a thickness between opposing first and second surfaces comprising:

- dry etching into the substrate from the first surface to form a first trench having a length and a width; and,
- removing substrate material through the second surface to  
20 form a second trench, wherein at least a portion of the first and second trenches intersect to form a slot through the substrate, and wherein the slot has an aspect ratio of greater than or equal to about 3.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

The Office argues that “Fujikawa teaches the width of the slot is 140 micrometers and the thickness of the substrate is 625 micrometers (see paragraph 0037-0038)”. Applicant respectfully disagrees. While Fujikawa is somewhat ambiguous, it appears that Fujikawa teaches a recess 10 having a width of 140 micrometers. However, recess 10 comprises a relatively narrow portion of ink supply port 9. Fujikawa’s Fig. 3 appears to describe the dimensions of ink supply port 9 in more detail.

Fig. 3 appears to show a bisected view of ink supply port 9 and has a corresponding value of 70 ( $140/2$ ) for recess 10, though the indicators are not specifically shown in Fig. 3. Fig. 3 appears to further show ink supply port 9 tapering outward to an opposite substrate surface width of 950 micrometers ( $475 \times 2$ ). As such, given that Fujikawa appears to teach a substrate thickness of 625 micrometers as suggest by the Office, the aspect ratio of the slot taught by Fujikawa is 0.658 ( $625/950$ ). As such Fujikawa does not teach or disclose “wherein the slot has an aspect ratio of greater than or equal to about 3” as recited in claim 10. As such claim 10 is allowable.

Claims 11-15 and 17-19 depend from claim 10 and as such contain all the limitations of claim 10. Fujikawa does not disclose the elements of claim 10 and as such does not disclose the elements of claims 11-15 and 17-19. For at least these reasons claims 11-15 and 17-19 are allowable.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

### Claims 21-26

Claim 21 recites in pertinent part:

A method of forming slots in a semiconductor substrate having first and  
5 second opposing surfaces comprising:

- dry etching a first trench through the first surface of the substrate; and,
- creating a second trench through the second surface of the substrate effective to form, in combination with the first  
10 trench, a slot at least a portion of which passes entirely through the substrate, wherein the maximum width of the slot is less than or equal to about 50 percent of the thickness of the substrate.

15 As described above in relation to claim 10 Fujikawa appears to disclose a slot width of 950 micrometers and a substrate thickness of 625 micrometers. In such a case, the slot width is greater than the thickness of the substrate. Fujikawa does not appear to disclose or suggest “wherein the maximum width of the slot is less than or equal to about 50 percent of the thickness of the substrate” as recited  
20 in claim 21. As such claim 21 is allowable.

Claims 22-26 depend from claim 21 and as such contain all the limitations of claim 21. Fujikawa does not disclose the elements of claim 21 and as such cannot disclose the elements of claims 22-26. For at least these reasons claims 22-26 are allowable.

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

Conclusion

Claims 4, 10-19 and 21-26 are believed to be in condition for allowance.  
Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the  
5 present application. Should any issue remain that prevents immediate issuance  
of the application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned  
attorney to discuss the unresolved issue.

10

Respectfully Submitted,  
Paul Mitchell  
Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
421 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 500  
Spokane, WA 99201

15

Dated: 12/8/03



---

Paul Mitchell  
Reg. No. 44,453  
Phone No. (509)324-9256x237